

**REMARKS / DISCUSSION OF ISSUES**

Claims 1 – 9 are pending in the application. Claims 1 and 7 are independent.

In the present response, claims 1 – 3 and 6 – 8 are amended. The support for the claim amendments may be found in Applicant's specification, for example, Fig. 4 and page 8, line 25 through page 9, line 7. No new matter is added.

**35 U.S.C. 112**

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In the present response, claim 2 is amended to obviate this rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, is respectfully requested.

**35 U.S.C. 102**

Claims 1 and 6 – 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) over Hill, US Patent 6,650,419.

Applicant submits that for at least the following reasons, claims 1 and 6 – 9 are patentable over Hill.

For example, claim 1, in part, requires:

*“a first elongated plane mirror reflector on the chuck that is elongated in the first direction X,” and*

*“a second elongated plane mirror reflector on the chuck that is elongated in the first direction X.”*

Hill, in Figs. 10a and 10b, discloses only one elongated mirror 340 on a translation stage 304. However, Hill does not disclose a first elongated mirror and a second elongated mirror that are both on the translation stage. Therefore, Hill fails to disclose the above claimed feature.

In view of at least the foregoing, Applicants submit that claim 1 is patentable over Hill.

Similarly, independent claim 7, in part, requires:

*“a first elongated reflector on the chuck,”* and

*“a second elongated reflector on the chuck.”*

Applicant essentially repeats the above arguments for claim 1 and applies them to claim 7 pointing out why Hill fails to disclose the claimed first and second elongated reflector on the chuck. Therefore, for at least the above reasons, claim 7 is patentable over Hill. Claims 6, 8 and 9 respectively depend from and inherit all the respective features of claims 1 and 7. Thus claims 6, 8 and 9 are patentable for at least the reason that they respectively depend from claims 1 and 7, with each claim containing further distinguishing features. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 6 – 9 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) is respectfully requested.

### **35 U.S.C. 103**

Under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) the Office Action rejects claim 2 over Hill; claims 3 – 5 over Hill in view of Hamada et al., US Patent 6,570,641, (hereinafter Hamada) and Cameron (US Patent 5,363,196).

Applicant submits that neither Hamada nor Cameron can cure the defects present in Hill as discussed above for claim 1, because nothing can be found in Hamada or Cameron that teaches or suggests the claimed first and second elongated reflectors on the chuck. Claims 2 – 5 depend from and inherit all the features of claim 1. Thus claims 2 – 5 are patentable for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, from which they depend, with each dependent claim containing further distinguishing patentable features. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2 – 5 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection(s) and/or rejection(s) of record, allow all the pending claims, and find the application in condition for allowance. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Hay Yeung Cheung/  
Hay Yeung Cheung  
Registration No.: 56,666  
Myers Wolin, LLC  
973-401-7157

**Please direct all correspondence to:**  
Corporate Counsel  
U.S. PHILIPS CORPORATION  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001